





**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# Overview & Scrutiny Commission

Title:	<b>Scrutiny Panel on the Societal Impact of the In-Year Grant Reductions</b>
Date:	<b>23 November 2010</b>
Time:	<b>2.30pm</b>
Venue	<b>Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall</b>
Members:	<b>Councillors:</b> Watkins (Chairman)  Mitchell Wakefield-Jarrett
Contact:	Mary van Beinum, Scrutiny Officer Telephone 01273 – 29 1062 e-mail: mary.vanbeinum@brighton-hove.gov.uk

	The Town Hall has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets
	An Induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter and infra red hearing aids are available for use during the meeting. If you require any further information or assistance, please contact the receptionist on arrival.
	<p align="center"><b>FIRE / EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE</b></p> <p>If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts;</li> <li>• Do not stop to collect personal belongings;</li> <li>• Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions; and</li> <li>• Do not re-enter the building until told that it is safe to do so.</li> </ul>

<b>Part One</b>	<b>Page</b>
12. Procedural Business	1 - 2
13. Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 October 2010	3 - 8
14. Chairman's Communications	
15. To Note Extract from 22 July Cabinet report and main area of Panel questions	9 - 18
16. To receive information from the Commissioner, Community Safety	
17. To receive further information on Sussex Safer Roads Partnership	19 - 24
18. To receive information on Local Transport Plan	
19. To receive further information on Grant Reductions from Department for Education	
20. Additional information; Draft Extract from Autism Scrutiny Panel and Playbuilder	25 - 26
21. Emerging themes and next steps	

The City Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public. Provision is also made on the agendas for public questions to committees and details of how questions can be raised can be found on the website and/or on agendas for the meetings.

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website [www.brighton-hove.gov.uk](http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk). Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, on audio tape or on disc, or translated into any other language as requested.

For further details and general enquiries about this meeting contact Mary van Beinum, (01273 291062 – email [mary.vanbeinum@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:mary.vanbeinum@brighton-hove.gov.uk)) or email [scrutiny@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

Date of Publication 17 November 2010

## AGENDA ITEM 12

### PROCEDURAL BUSINESS.

#### A. Declaration of Substitutes

Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Select Committees or Scrutiny Panels.

#### B. Declarations of Interest

- (1) To seek declarations of any personal or personal & prejudicial interests under Part 2 of the Code of Conduct for Members in relation to matters on the Agenda. Members who do declare such interests are required to clearly describe the nature of the interest.
- (2) A Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission, an Overview and Scrutiny Committee or a Select Committee has a prejudicial interest in any business at meeting of that Committee where –
  - (a) that business relates to a decision made (whether implemented or not) or action taken by the Executive or another of the Council's committees, sub-committees, joint committees or joint sub-committees; and
  - (b) at the time the decision was made or action was taken the Member was
    - (i) a Member of the Executive or that committee, sub-committee, joint committee or joint sub-committee and
    - (ii) was present when the decision was made or action taken.
- (3) If the interest is a prejudicial interest, the Code requires the Member concerned:-
  - (a) to leave the room or chamber where the meeting takes place while the item in respect of which the declaration is made is under consideration. [There are three exceptions to this rule which are set out at paragraph (4) below].
  - (b) not to exercise executive functions in relation to that business and
  - (c) not to seek improperly to influence a decision about that business.
- (4) The circumstances in which a Member who has declared a prejudicial interest is permitted to remain while the item in respect of which the interest has been declared is under consideration are:-

(a) for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the item, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise, BUT the Member must leave immediately after he/she has made the representations, answered the questions, or given the evidence,

(b) if the Member has obtained a dispensation from the Standards Committee, or

(c) if the Member is the Leader or a Cabinet Member and has been required to attend before an Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committee to answer questions.

#### C. Declaration of party whip

To seek declarations of the existence and nature of any party whip in relation to any matter on the Agenda as set out at paragraph 8 of the Overview and Scrutiny Ways of Working.

#### D. Exclusion of press and public

To consider whether, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, or the nature of the proceedings, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting when any of the following items are under consideration.

*NOTE: Any item appearing in Part 2 of the Agenda states in its heading the category under which the information disclosed in the report is confidential and therefore not available to the public.*

*A list and description of the exempt categories is available for public inspection at Brighton and Hove Town Halls.*

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE SOCIETAL IMPACT OF THE IN-YEAR GRANT REDUCTIONS**

**2.30pm 29 OCTOBER 2010**

**COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Watkins (Chairman) Councillors Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett

**PART ONE**

**1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1. Declarations of Substitutes**

Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Panels or Select Committees.

**2. Declarations of Interests**

There were none

**3. Declaration of Party Whip**

There were none.

**4. Exclusion of Press and Public**

In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I (1) of the said Act.

**RESOLVED:** That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**2. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS**

2.1 The Chairman reminded the meeting that anyone could give information to the Panel in private session if they wished, or to an individual member of the Panel in the presence of a scrutiny officer.

2.2 The Panel comprised Councillors Watkins (Chair) Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett; a fourth Panel Member was not taking part in the scrutiny review.

**3. TO NOTE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO PANEL SCOPING MEETING**

3.1 The Panel noted the information set out for the scoping meeting.

**4. FINANCIAL CONTEXT OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW**

4.1 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services tabled a detailed timeline of significant officer-arranged meetings between the initial announcement of the in-year grant reductions and

the 22 July Cabinet report. Other meetings would have taken place but senior officers had now left the Council so these were difficult to specify. When the initial announcements were made there would have been discussions with partners including the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum , Head Teachers, Police, Heath and Transport.

4.2 It would not have been possible in early June to ascertain the possible impact of the unexpected cuts. The Sussex Safer Roads Partnership information (Item 8 ) gives one example of how reductions were dealt with.

4.3 The Panel noted that the in-year reductions were unprecedented. Decisions were made quickly in response to the grant losses to minimise their impact, this created complications particularly where partners were involved.

4.4 Members asked about the process for assessing risks and how societal impacts could have been understood as the process went ahead. Also, because of the pressure of circumstances, to what extent the reductions were absorbed within internal Council budgets.

4.5 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services pointed out that the circumstances would have been different in different service areas; some reductions would have had direct impact on services. Some of the grant funding was paid direct to partners and in other areas the Council receives the funding and passes it on. Even after 2 months it was still difficult to analyse what impact the reductions would have.

4.6 Most of the grant reductions were direct to the Local Authority but they would have had implications for services provided by other bodies. Some small funding changes would have large impacts.

4.7 Regarding the preparatory work done prior to 22 July, the Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services said that technical officers who had the discussions in their own service areas would be better placed to comment.

4.8 The Chairman said it was important for officers and Members to understand the basis of how the decisions were made, in dealing with any similar circumstances in future.

4.9 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services emphasised that the implications of some grant reductions were clearer than others, in that they applied to a single specific scheme or were already scheduled to be discontinued. Others had far more issues to be resolved; for instance involving employment or service contracts and having wider repercussions on services elsewhere.

4.10 The CEO, Community and Voluntary Sector Forum (CVSF) gave the example of Connexions, stating that there had been no formal opportunity for partners to put forward their views on the impact of cuts. Information that Connexions was 'at risk' had been shared. However ideally there should have been more transparency than there had been time to achieve, she said.

4.11 The CEO CVSF told the Panel that officers were struggling to find information on the outcomes of Connexions. She stressed that this information was important in order to be able to compare and contrast whether a service could or could not be cut.

4.12 Replying to a question from the Chairman on the lead-in time for decision-making the Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services said that time was of the essence; the longer the time taken to decide, the deeper the reductions needed. The Council had decided to make reductions in line with Government announcements.

4.13 A Panel Member suggested there would have been political direction and an early political steer would have impacted on the outcomes. A choice could have been made between accepting the cuts in the service departments or alternatively releasing contingency funds and allowing more time to better understand potential impacts, to take through to the annual budget-setting process.

4.14 The Panel queried the checks and balances that were in place to make such assessments, in the context of the current changes in the officer structure of the Council, the move to Intelligent Commissioning and May 2011 local elections.

4.15 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services tabled an example of the information provided to decision-makers during the period following the in-year reductions announcements. He told the Panel that following the Comprehensive Spending Review, grants cuts were not expected to happen again to the same extent. The existing number of grants - around 120 at present – are to be greatly reduced and many merged and incorporated into the general Formula Grant. Funding decisions would therefore be simpler where the grants remain ring-fenced; where grant funds are merged, there will be more local choice and flexibility and a wider debate on funding options.

## **5. REPORTS TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND EXTRACTS FROM THE DRAFT MINUTES**

5.1 The Head of Housing Strategy and Development referred to the report to ASCHOSC on the £164,000 Supporting People Administration grant cut which he said had been absorbed within the programme as a whole. An Equalities Impact Assessment had been carried out. The Supporting People Programme itself was to continue.

5.2 Asked whether the administration element would need to be re-visited in the future the Head of Housing Strategy and Development replied that services for vulnerable people would be monitored with Partners including in health, social care and crime and disorder. An overall benefit of £3.24 had been identified for every £1 spent on Supporting People services locally.

5.3 The Head of Sport and Leisure introduced the report on free swimming and said the two-year grant was aimed at increasing sports participation prior to the London Olympics. The scheme was always intended to end in March 2011. A key health objective for NHS Brighton & Hove is a reduction in childhood obesity and therefore they supported the initiative. There was strong partnership working in this area and with continued funding from NHS Brighton & Hove the initiative continued over the summer holidays and was extended for the under-11s until 31 March 2011. Figures showed significant increases in the number of swims by those aged 16 and under and aged 60 and over, compared to before the initiative started. An Equalities Impact Assessment had been carried out.

5.4 He said it was hoped that despite a reduction in the opportunities to swim free of charge, that more people would have developed a swimming 'habit.' There were discussions about the possibility of a leisure card scheme or continuing the initiative in some form after March 2011.

5.5 He stated that a capital grant had enabled excellent new changing facilities at St Lukes Community Pool.

5.6 The Panel commented that the existing strong joint working with the Primary Care Trust had enabled the swimming grant cut to be offset to some degree. There was a question whether working with groups of GPs in place of the PCT in future, could cause difficulty in reaching joint funding agreements.

## **6. DISCUSSION WITH CHAIRMAN OF BRIGHTON & HOVE COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SECTOR FORUM**

6.1 The Chief Executive Officer of the CVSF tabled a paper replying to the main areas of the scrutiny panel questions plus a position statement on public spending cuts following consultation with CVSF member organisations. CVSF had a limited role but there were areas where the Forum could help in working with the Local Authority and intelligent commissioning and help contribute to robust decision-making. The experience for CVSF regarding the in-year reductions related mostly to Connexions for which there had been a £500,000 reduction.

6.2 Main points made by the CEO, CVSF were;

- It is possible to assess a service in advance of a change even when there is a tight timescale.
- This information needed to be reviewed fully before taking a decision. In the case of Connexions there was not enough information to hand on outputs or outcomes.
- It is feasible to seek feedback from service users.
- Services can be prioritised according to whether or not they are statutory requirements or deliver a priority within the Sustainable Community Strategy.
- Equalities impact assessments are key to enable the voice of vulnerable people to be heard, as those people can tend to be most affected by cuts.

6.3 Asked where the relevant information would be held, the CEO said she had been surprised that relevant information was not available to council officers on what was being delivered for the money spent. She was disappointed by the information she found including within voluntary organisations; she argued that this was an area of challenge for all organisations.

6.4 The Panel commented that Local Strategic Partnership indicators such as numbers not in education employment or training (NEETs) and teenage pregnancies would indicate that Connexions was having a positive effect. Needs assessments and monitoring outcomes had to be done better in future, to improve services and resilience to future budget changes.

6.5 Answering a query if CVSF and volunteers were pressurised to cover service areas that had formerly been officer-led, the CEO told the Panel that there had been no formal contact about services relating to Connexions other than contracted organisations should continue business as usual. There had been no discussion around how Connexions or similar services will be adapted to accommodate changing needs or to respond to a likely scenario of increasing needs. Large companies had contracts in this area and the expectation was that smaller organisations would step in, though there was no evidence to show this.



6.6 Changes to this service would impact on young people and the long-term future of the service and it was important not to lose experience in this area. There had been no opportunity to have a dialogue, she said.

6.7 The CEO, CVSF said that cuts could have a disproportionate effect on organisations in the voluntary sector; unless there is adequate formal communication, future plans could not be properly made.

6.8 There was a suggestion that potential impact of a cut should be assessed to give a fuller picture and more robust decision. Cuts might otherwise be perceived as slicing where it seemed easiest.

6.9 The Chair questioned the strength of the Council's overall partnership working process in terms of dialogue and joint decision-making. He referred to evidence given the Autism Scrutiny Panel, of which he was a member, on the role of Connexions in transition from Childrens' to Adults' services. (Autism Panel extract)

6.10 The Chairman remarked that if there is a lack of information on the outcome of services, in cases where funding ring-fence may be removed in future, the local authority will have more flexibility but it would be more difficult to see the basis of decisions.

6.11 The CEO CVSF ended by stating that the In-year cuts provided great opportunities for transparency and new levels of working together. The Voluntary sector could help by investigating the cost of services and could also lever in additional funds. She was of the strong view that there is massive potential in closer joint working, that could easily be tapped.

6.12 The CEO CVSF was asked how to avoid unnecessary alarm when there were countless options in making cuts. In reply she gave the view that it had to be agreed at the start what outcomes were needed – what services had to be protected. When that agreement was in place, openness and early and wide engagement on potential changes would help to reduce damaging speculation.

6.13 A Panel Member remarked that some voluntary organisations seemed to have been given misleading information on different occasions about whether or not the Youth Capital Fund was continuing.

6.14 Asked about the current membership and joint working within the CVSF itself, the CEO said in a difficult economic climate, timely partnerships were being encouraged within the sector. However it could be difficult to facilitate organisations joining together and some of those who do not back this approach could face difficulties. Housing and Youth Services were examples. Small grants could still do much to protect some areas that were most at risk.

6.15 It was especially important to maintain good levels of communications during difficult economic conditions and to understand a changing model of partnership working. This approach would underpin intelligent commissioning.

6.16 CEO CVSF said she welcomed the 19 October Overview and Scrutiny Commission decision to co-opt a member of the CVSF for the purposes of scrutiny of the 2011-2012 budget proposals.

**7. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT; SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

7.1 The Panel asked that Officers attend a future panel meeting to present the Equalities Impact Assessment of School Improvement.

7.2 Members also asked to see EIAs relating to the in-year grant reductions. For example, 'dropped kerbs' in the LTP Capital programme 2010 – 2011 Rolling Programme of working on walking facilities.

**8. UPDATE ON SUSSEX SAFER ROADS PARTNERSHIP (SSRP)**

8.1 The Panel asked that Officers attend a future panel meeting to present the Update on Sussex Safer Roads Partnership.

**9. HOUSING AND PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT**

9.1 The Head of Planning Strategy said that this grant varied from year to year. It had originally been performance-related and based on variable measures. Initially the emphasis was on encouraging prompt development control decisions, and more recently on streamlining plan-making and housing delivery. The grant 2010 – 2011 was to be spent primarily on IT systems to ensure planning processes ran smoothly, helping to improve performance on planning applications and reducing paper handling.

9.2 Latterly grant amounts had become less predictable and the announcements made later (well into the financial year of the settlement) and had already been identified as at risk. Adjustments had been made to reduce reliance on the grant for core activities and ensure permanent posts were incorporated into the core planning budget.

**10. PLAYBUILDER**

10.1 The Head of Financial Services (Corporate and Environment) said there had been a revised allocation to be presented in the next TBM report. Members referred to the original decision involving 22 Playbuilder sites agreed by 23 April Cabinet and asked what had been the basis for deciding on which 11 of the 22 could go ahead. It was suggested that the process for finding a capital shortfall could be an area of learning,

10.2 The CEO CVSF acknowledged that Playbuilder sites were a difficult choice. The CVSF was in a good position to help facilitate discussions through informal networks; for instance in these circumstances though 'Friends of Parks' groups.

**11. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING**

11.1 An informal meeting would be held on 4<sup>th</sup> November at 2pm.

11.2 Meeting in public on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> November at 2.30 in the HTH Council Chamber

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

**EXTRACT FROM 22 JULY CABINET REPORT:  
'2010/2011 IN-YEAR GOVERNMENT GRANT REDUCTIONS'**

***£1.580m reduction (24%) in Area Based Grant (ABG) funding received from the Department of Education (DoE).***

3.14 There are a number of areas of work funded by ABG where the government is signalling changes in policy direction and long term reductions in funding which the council needs to anticipate and respond to. There are summarised below:

- **Connexions service - £500,000 reduction**  
There are strong indications that the government will move from a Connexions service in its current form and shift responsibility for statutory information advice and guidance (formerly known as Careers guidance) directly to schools. It is likely that the rest of the grant will be vulnerable in the longer term. The reduction anticipates this change while protecting that element of the service that we assume will continue. This will mean de-commissioning some of the targeted services provided and this will impact on both council and community and voluntary sector provision. This reduction is in addition to the £200,000 reduction in spend on the Connexions service agreed as part of the budget setting process for 2010/11.
- **School improvement £435,000 reduction**  
A fundamental shift in the local authority's relationship with schools is expected which will be matched by long term funding reductions particularly for the local authority's school improvement function. The local authority's role will become more strategic and its operational service will be focused on schools with the greatest need (ie low levels of attainment or in an Ofsted category). The proposed reduction in ABG will therefore be managed as part of an overall review of the CYPT's school improvement function to ensure a core offer is available to schools in need and will involve consulting with schools about the viability of offering a buy back service. This review will include the management of the reduction of central support for the National Strategies which are due to end in March 2011 anyway.
- **Extended schools £48,000 reduction**  
We anticipate that in the future the government will only fund the childcare element of extended schools funding through local authorities and it will be up to schools to determine what their extended offer should be. The proposed reduction of 15% in this area is considered to be a reasonable interim step.

Further savings have been identified as follows;

- Children's Fund grant allocation has £167,000 uncommitted
- A review of 14-19 provision following the council taking on responsibility from the Learning & Skills Council in April this year has resulted in £30,000 efficiency savings.

- £115,000 can be achieved through releasing projected underspends against the grant funding, not recruiting to existing vacancies and smaller efficiencies savings.

In addition £195,000 of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be used to protect all of the funding currently in ABG for the Autistic Spectrum Condition support service, speech therapy services and a learning mentor in the Behaviour & Attendance team. A further £90,000 of DSG has been earmarked to support ABG reductions as a whole.

**£105,000 reduction (26.5%) in Road Safety Grant Revenue plus £88,000 in Road Safety Grant Capital (100%)**

- 3.15 This overall 40% reduction in grant will be passed on to the Road Safety Partnership who will need to reprioritise within the reduced funding available. Given the severity of the reduction, discussions are now underway with West and East Sussex County Councils, Sussex Police Authority and Her Majesty's Court Service and Sussex Safer Roads Partnership, to determine the future viability of the Partnership and implications of the pan Sussex road safety programme. Proposals will be developed by the end of July.

**£30,000 reduction (7.8%) in Home Office funding and £56,000 reduction (29%) in Prevent Grant**

- 3.16 These savings will be achieved through a combination of additional income, efficiency savings and a reduction in specific projects to be agreed in consultation with the community.

**£164,000 reduction (100%) in Supporting People Administration**

- 3.17 The government's expectation is that Supporting People Administration could be incorporated into the administration of other related activities. In the short term this will be funded from an underspend that is created through low utilisation/voids in some services, re-charging and also an additional saving that was created due to decommissioning a service earlier than planned. £119,000 of the reduction will be funded from underspends in the Supporting People welfare grant and the remaining £45,000 from the Housing Strategy revenue budget. There is no reduction in any current funding levels for any of our Supporting People services in this financial year so there will be no impact on existing services. As part of the planning for the 2011/12 budget consideration will be given to how the administration of Supporting People could be delivered alongside other services to achieve this saving on a recurrent basis.

**£120,000 reduction (100%) in Housing & Planning Delivery Grant**

- 3.18 The original intention of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant was to act as an incentive to local authorities to bring forward housing and prepare the ground for increased delivery but is now considered by the Government to be an ineffective and excessively complex incentive. Therefore on value for

money grounds the council will reduce its related staffing expenditure accordingly and consider alternative models for meeting its aspirations in respect of housing numbers.

**£125,000 reduction (65%) in Free Swimming Grant**

- 3.19 This reduction assumes free swimming for Under 16s and Over 60s stops at the end of July. One off funding of £25,000 will be drawn from the risk provision to take this to the beginning of September in order to ensure that free swimming for both age groups can take place throughout the school holidays as this has already been publicised to families and carers. In addition the PCT has committed to provide £38,500 funding to enable free swimming for Under 11s to continue until the end of March 2011 as part of their work on reducing obesity in this age group. A further £8,000 will need to be provided by the Council to put this in place.

**£171,000 reduction (100%) in LABGI funding**

- 3.20 This funding had not yet been committed so there is no impact on services of this reduction.

**£1.240m reduction (76% of Integrated Transport capital grant funding) for Local Transport Plan (LTP)**

- 3.21 This has been a particularly difficult area to make the required funding reductions due to earlier reductions in the LTP programme, contractual commitments, match funding requirements particularly for the projects with Civitas and Cycle England, essential highway maintenance and the need to prioritise road safety.

£431,000 will be saved by deferring projects that have not yet commenced with a view to re-profiling them into future year's programmes should they still remain a priority.

- Final minor works at the North Street Scheme (£42,000)
- New Road/Church Street Scheme (£55,000)
- A 50% reduction in funding set aside for the Queen's Park Safer Routes to Schools Scheme, which is currently out for consultation (£55,000)
- East Street Walking Scheme (£250,000)
- Walking Facilities – Dropped Kerbs (£29,000)

The following capital budgets totalling £115,000 will be removed or reduced:

- Design of future schemes (£35,000)
- Contingency for residual spend on completed schemes (£79,000)
- Other public transport information will be reduced by £4,000 with £2,000 transferred to pedestrian signing and £1,000 accessible bus stops (£1,000)

As this is somewhat short of the funding reduction required alternative funding sources have been identified to safeguard other important pieces of work:

- the Woodingdean Crossroads scheme which is considered essential to maintain effective traffic flows once the Community Stadium is operational through capital receipts funding connected to the sale of land at Park Wall Farm, Falmer (£410,000)
- ensure no cuts to the street lighting budget through use of a windfall capital receipt in relation to successful legal challenge on the coast protection scheme (£150,000)
- a further contribution from the coast protection monies to support the Bridges/Structures budget (14,000)
- fund the statutory Highways Asset Management Plan from revenue resources through reprioritising some minor highways works (£120,000)

The revised LTP programme is shown at APPENDIX 2. [See below MvB]

***Impact of the further announcements in from the Department for Education made on the 14<sup>th</sup> July***

3.22 Further announcements have been made by the Department for Education (DfE), Those in respect of capital have been particularly complex and have been gradually clarified but are not yet necessarily fully understood at the time of writing this report. They have been summarised at APPENDIX 3. [See below MvB] The government is making reductions in co location projects but the Whitehawk Co-location project is sufficiently well progressed that it will not be one of the projects to be cut. The project is on target to meet its aims and will therefore be one of 98 projects to receive continued funding. Most other funding reductions are still being analysed at the time of writing this report. Any further updates will be provided to Cabinet orally at the meeting. In many cases the DfE is withdrawing funding for specific schemes and this will mean they are unable to go ahead. The only area where it is proposed for the Council to provide additional funding to offset the lost grant is the £61,000 reduction in the Youth Capital Fund. It is proposed that the council replaces this grant reduction from its one off risk provision in order to minimise the impact on the community and voluntary sector of the 28 one-off projects funded from this source. If this was not done there is a risk that a significant number of those projects would be unable to go ahead. It is proposed that the relevant Cabinet Member Meetings take any necessary decisions on reductions in expenditure that may be required as a result of this.

***Removal of ringfences***

3.23 It is not proposed to make use of the additional flexibility provided by the removal of ringfences on certain grants because these remain priority areas for expenditure. This means for example that there will be no reduction in planned expenditure on HIV/AIDS support grant.

## APPENDIX 2

### LTP CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/11

SCHEME	Original Allocation (£000s)	Revised LTP funding (£000s)	Other funding (£000s)
<b>MAINTENANCE</b>			
<b>Completed Works</b>			
Footway Maintenance	50	50	
<b>Committed Spend</b>			
Essential Road Maintenance	200	200	
Highway Asset Management Plan	120	0	120
<b>Rolling Programmes</b>			
Highway Maintenance (carriageway)	160	160	
Street Lighting	150	0	150
Bridges/Structures	50	36	14
<b>MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>£730</b>	<b>£446</b>	<b>£284</b>
<b>INTEGRATED TRANSPORT</b>			
<b>Completed Works/Spend</b>			
Cycling Routes A23 ATC	150	150	
Other Public Transport Information	20	16	
<b>Commitments to ongoing projects from 2009/10</b>			
North Street	450	408	
New Road/Church Street junction and crossing	60	5	
Pedestrian Signing	0	2	
Accessible Bus Stops	0	1	
<b>Commitments to Casualty Reduction including LAA target</b>			
Road Safety Engineering	272	272	
Safer Routes to School	110	55	
<b>Committed Match Funding and Partnership Projects</b>			
Travel info - cycle counters (Civitas)	13	13	
Bike off (Civitas)	11	11	
Cyclist Signing	0	0	
Cycling Facilities - Cycle parking	110	110	
Travel Awareness	80	80	
Individualised Travel Choices	80	80	
Business Travel Plan Funding	35	35	
Emissions VMS (Civitas)	28	28	
School Travel Plan	25	25	
Walking Network East St	267	17	
Missing Links Funding (ROWIP)	10	10	
<b>Rolling Programme of</b>			
Walking Facilities - Dropped Kerbs	29	0	

<b>Works</b>			
	Easy Access Route (ROWIP)	0	0
	Access to Rail	0	0
	Scoping/design of future schemes (including BSG)	50	15
	Completion of committed 2009/10 schemes	79	0
	Journey Time Analysis	0	0
<b>New Construction Works</b>	Woodingdean Crossroads	410	0
	<b>INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,289</b>	<b>£1,333</b>
	<b>INTEGRATED TRANSPORT &amp; MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>£3,019</b>	<b>£1,779</b>

**REDUCTION IN GRANT FUNDING**

**£1,240**

**REVISED BUDGET**

**£1,779    £1,779**



## APPENDIX 3

### Latest Department for Education Grant announcements

Government Department and name of grant	2010/11 Original Grant £'000	2010/11 Revised Grant £'000	Change in grant allocation £'000	% Change
<b>Revenue Grants</b>				
<b>Department for Education</b>				
Local Delivery Support Grant (Note 1)	194	136	-58	-30%
Youth Capital Fund (Note 2)	122	61	-61	-50%
Extended Schools Capital (Note 3)	183	83	-100	-55%
Harnessing Technology Grant (Note 4)	660	332	-328	-50%
Targeted Capital Fund (funded over 2 years) (Note 4)	8,000	7340	-660	-8%
Sure Start (Note 5)	3,801	3,501	-300	-8%
Playbuilder (Note 6)	598	?	?	?
<b>Total Additional Estimated Reduction</b>				

#### **Note 1: Delivery Support Grant**

The Local Delivery Support Grant is provided to local authorities to help with preparation for the delivery of 14 to 19 Education Reforms. Allocations are based on the number of young people in each authority area and the number of new Diploma lines offered for the first time in each authority. The allocation has been reduced as part of the DfE's scaling back of support for delivery of Diplomas. The providers have been informed of the revised allocation and are confident that the Diplomas can still be provided within this reduced budget.

#### **Note 2: Youth Capital Funding**

This fund has been used to allocate funding to small groups for one-off capital projects. The government announcement anticipated that local authorities would honour all existing commitments in this area.

#### **Note 3: Extended Schools Capital**

The impact of this is still being analysed.

#### **Note 4: Harnessing Technology Grant**

This grant is mainly delegated to schools. The impact of this is still being analysed.

#### **Note 5: Targeted Capital Fund (TCF)**

TCF funding paid to local authorities not in BSF is to be cut by roughly £660k per LA. This will affect Brighton & Hove as we did receive this funding (£8 million over 2 years). The impact of this is still being analysed.

**Note 6: Sure Start**

The Department for Education has announced its intention to manage down the capital expenditure from the Sure Start Early Years & Childcare Grant. The proposal is to identify any projects not yet fully contracted. In Brighton & Hove, all Children's Centres projects are contracted and the budget is fully allocated. The latest advice is that 3 Early Years projects have been allowed to proceed. However the Bevendean Children's association project can only partially proceed saving £0.14m. A further unallocated contingency of £0.16m has been removed giving an estimated total reduction of £0.3m. All of this is still subject to final confirmation.

**Note 7: Playbuilder**

The original CLG announcement on 10<sup>th</sup> June included the un-ringfencing of the Playbuilder grant but at that time the funding level was unchanged. Originally the intention was that this flexibility would not be used to protect the current schemes under consultation. This was set out at Council on 15<sup>th</sup> July. However, in recent days the Department for Education has instructed local authorities not to incur any future contractual liabilities in relation to Playbuilder. The Council has £0.598m allocated in 2010/11. However the funding is now being cut and this will change the position. The amount of the reduction is not yet known.

**MAIN AREAS OF PANEL QUESTIONS**

- 1. What was the preparation process before and after the Cabinet decision of 22<sup>nd</sup> July?**
- 2. To what extent can the impact be judged prior to taking a decision? And afterwards? In the short term and longer term.**
- 3. What are the aims and objective of the budgets that were affected by the in-year grant reductions?**
- 4. What was the in-year reduction in monetary terms and as % of original grant?**
- 5. How are funding streams affected by the removal of ring-fencing and how does that affect decisions made?**
- 6. How to deal with joint programmes with partnership organisations including eg matched funding?**
- 7. What has been done in implementing the changes so far? What is happening now?**
- 8. What have been the key issues in making the cuts? (challenges eg contractual; plus opportunities)**
- 9. To help understand potential impacts - how can the effects of the reductions be mitigated?**
- 10. How has EqlA work been considered? What groups or categories of groups were, or could be, affected? Views on how these in-year budget cuts could potentially impact on groups? Short-term and longer term.**
- 11. How to ensure groups in receipt of grants via different Council services and/or partner organisations are not disproportionately affected. i.e. linking cuts decisions within the Council and with partner organisations?**



### Update on Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP)

A meeting with the Asst Chief Constable Sussex Police, LHA directors and HMCS on the 13<sup>th</sup> July confirmed the 58% reduction in funding for SSRP from the Specific Road Safety Grant made available to partnerships through the LHAS. This level of reduction was the result of the Government withdrawal of the capital grant, reduction of the revenue element by 27% (representing an average total grant reduction of 40%) and the previously agreed 18% grant withhold by the 3 Local Authorities.

As a result, the SSRP Strategy Sub-Group met to identify areas to negate the £400k gap between the latest business plan and the funding available. The plan was revised and a new conclusion on the budget requirements reached. A meeting of the SSRP staff at Shoreham identified further reductions and a new realignment of the budget.

Please see Activity Matrix Appendix 'A' that identifies the original business plan of £3.315m and the result of various cuts to reach the present business plan costs of £1.87m. It also shows the activities in priority order according to the 'points awarded' structure in respect of strategic priority value of each activity

The methodology employed to bridge the £400k gap, with Police support, was to utilise the anticipated Speed Awareness course surplus from this year. This figure is based upon the surplus from 2009/10 and is estimated at approximately £200k. Additionally, the Strategy Sub-Group agreed to widen the scope of the courses, raising the potential for another 8,000 clients per annum. When the normal ratio of accepted offers is applied, it is estimated that will translate into an additional £70k surplus.

Other adjustments have been made to the business plan, which include current vacant establishment posts not being filled in the Central Ticket Office, a reduction in consultancy hours and provision of cover for maternity leave. There is still a shortfall of approximately £45k in this year's expenditure forecast, but it is anticipated that there will be fluctuations in expenditure that may have a 'smoothing effect'.

### CONSEQUENCE AND IMPACT OF CUTS

The savings of the latest round of cuts will compound the already significant impact on road safety being promoted by the Partnership.

For instance, since 1994 the introduction of cameras has contributed to the reduction of casualties across Sussex. On a rolling 12 month period, KSI casualties have been reduced at camera sites by 90 per annum, which is a 67% reduction from the 3 year baseline data. At fixed cameras this reduction is 72%. The former saving at all sites equates to a cost saving to society of £42m annually, using the DfT Highway Economic Notes (HEN) as a guide. It should be noted that any reduction in camera activity, including the long term effect of maintenance cuts, could lead to an increase in vehicle speeds, which in turn could lead to more serious injuries to road casualties. There is also

some jeopardy to the great opportunity, through referral, to educate drivers, via the Speed Awareness courses. These courses are an alternative method of case disposal and last year 7000 people benefitted from this form of driver education in Sussex. This is vital in trying to educate drivers and changing the culture regarding speeding to make it socially unacceptable viz a viz 'drink driving'.

Education is as important as enforcement and any further reduction in the current budget would mean a severe impact on delivery of schemes which are targeting key priority groups, regarded as the most vulnerable through data intelligence. Such Education projects delivered through the SSRP are those which were considered to have benefit across the whole Sussex area, as well as having the potential to be cost effectively delivered across Sussex, as opposed to on a local basis.

Specific projects for Brighton & Hove (non- pan Sussex or shared) that have been affected by the reduction in funding are:

- Child Pedestrian Trainer wages (no further funding from SSRP for the remainder of this financial year original support £22.5k – reduced by approx £14k)
- Biekeability Coordinator salary (funding reduced from £24k to £20k)
- Biekability Trainer mandatory assessments (funding withdrawn £1520)
- Speed Indicator Device (SID) Operator (salary for p/t operator funding withdrawn £11500) – vacancy now being held.
- White Nights event (funding withdrawn £8k)
- Warning Lights in Vicinity of Schools (funding withdrawn £7.7k)

**NB.** Brighton & Hove participate in several of the projects shown on Appendix A and the list above is purely those that are unique to B&H.

Early bookings and commitments were made by the SSRP Communications Manager to save money over the year, but there is now no funding available, which restricts the ability to support projects and events with additional marketing material once the current crop expires.

## **OPPORTUNITIES**

There are potential revenue streams available through promotions such as the internationally award winning 'Embrace Life' video, which has potential customers world- wide, currently being primed.

Another is the development of the 'Routes' educational programme, with sales already agreed with Michelin and interest from as far afield as Australia. There is also an opportunity for international linkage on road safety research and evaluation due to this particular project.

The potential for centralising certain projects from an administrative perspective has already been outlined in Appendix 'A'. Speed awareness is

making significant progress in this field and will be looking to integrate by October.

There are opportunities to adopt a different style of marketing by utilising the internet in different forms, which has already proved its power by the success of 'Embrace Life'.

### **FURTHER WORK**

The Strategy Group is identifying options for 2011/12, based on the Directors' meeting recommendations that funding scenarios of 0%, 25% and 50% be considered, with the aim of circulating a discussion document prior to the Leaders Group meeting, provisionally set for the 5<sup>th</sup> October. Although these levels of funding are purely hypothetical at this time, pending the Government's Autumn public spending review, it was felt that we should explore the options and have some provisional models for SSRP structure/function and to identify the risks and opportunities of each of these levels, ahead of any formal announcements or decisions regarding funding.

*Phil Clarke*

*Road Safety Manager*

*18<sup>th</sup> August 2010*





## Sussex Safer Roads Partnership

### 2010/11 Activity Priority Matrix

APPENDIX A

	Activity	Assessment	Original Planned Spend	Revised Planned Spend	Agreed Budget Reduction	Actual Spend 1st Qtr	Projected Spend to end of F/yr	Mimumum Required Budget
Group								
Camera	21000	New camera equipment	£438,000	£38,000	£38,000	£0	£0	£0
Camera	21001	Camera & Data core busines	£1,887,900	£1,827,570	£391,744	£306,751	£1,129,075	£1,435,826
E&E	42001	Op Ride	£30,000	£25,000	£21,384	£1,866	£1,750	£3,616
ETP	52207	ROUTES	£25,000	£25,000	£4,983	£5,817	£14,200	£20,017
E&E	42003	Enforcement Equipment	£15,000	£15,000	£10,000	£0	£5,000	£5,000
Comms	31003	Comms cumulative activity	£265,000	£100,000	-£20,047	£112,047	£8,000	£120,047
ETP	52002	2 PCSO	£60,000	£60,000	£49,663	£6,837	£3,500	£10,337
E&E	41002	Casualty Reduction Initiatives	£20,000	£20,000	£19,988	-£4,988	£5,000	£12
E&E	41003	KSI Remedial Fund	£5,000	£5,000	-£8,192	£22,192	-£9,000	£13,192
ETP	52003	Ped Trainers Part Time	£78,013	£78,050	£60,432	£14,618	£3,000	£17,618
ETP	51006	FRS RS Coordinator	£26,000	£26,000	£5,000	£0	£21,000	£21,000
ETP	51008	Coaching for safer Sussex	£30,000	£30,000	£5,000	£0	£25,000	£25,000
ETP	52004	COSTS	£30,000	£30,000	£23,190	£2,810	£4,000	£6,810
E&E	42005	Bikesafe	£30,000	£30,000	£15,000	£0	£15,000	£15,000
E&E	42006	Make the commitment 'Kill Yo	£20,000	£20,000	-£7	£6,807	£13,200	£20,007
PP	71002	Operation Crackdown	£90,000	£90,000	£14,810	£18,690	£56,500	£75,190
ETP	52001	Instructors Training / Assessme	£32,111	£32,111	£12,127	-£16	£20,000	£19,984
ETP	52005	Pass Plus	£40,800	£40,800	£31,381	£8,419	£1,000	£9,419
ETP	51003	APE Theatre	£23,000	£23,000	£5,000	£0	£18,000	£18,000
ETP	51005	Review of Road Safety Educ.	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£0	£0	£0
ETP	53005	Firebike	£10,000	£10,000	£9,000	£0	£1,000	£1,000
ETP	51001	SID	£107,800	£107,800	£74,635	£23,165	£10,000	£33,165
ETP	51007	Moped Focus Group	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£0	£0	£0
ETP	53007	White Knights Event	£8,000	£8,000	£8,000	£0	£0	£0
E&E	41007	VAS in vicinity of Schools	£16,220	£16,220	£16,220	£0	£0	£0
E&E	41010	School Crossing Flashing Light	£7,777	£8,000	£8,000	£0	£0	£0
			<b>£3,315,621</b>	<b>£2,685,551</b>	<b>£815,311</b>	<b>£525,015</b>	<b>£1,345,225</b>	<b>£1,870,240</b>



## AGENDA ITEM 20

Draft note of Amaze information to the Autism Scrutiny Panel  
15 October 2010

Amaze has one part-time transition worker – who is working on developing person-centred planning across the city. Amaze works with both mainstream and special schools and young people and parents of any young person aged 14 and over, not only those who have a statement of special educational needs.

There are some 1500 children and young people on the 'Compass' SEN database, (thought to include only around half of those with special needs) of which those on the autistic spectrum form the second largest group.

Asked about grant funding cuts related to Connexions, Amaze is concerned at the potential loss of this service. Young people at the more severe end of the autistic spectrum can be supported by transition social workers. However transition to college and adulthood is difficult for all, whether or not autism may be a factor.

Parents of young people with less severe autism have contacted Amaze to ask what help is available to deal with concerns about transition if there is no Connexions worker available; for instance what reasonable adjustments may be made.

Amaze is concerned about the quality of transition plans. It is important that the autistic young person is at the centre of planning for college and adulthood.

This cannot be done cheaply and resources needed for support in acquiring skills needed as an adult should not be underestimated and should be safeguarded.

